



LEARNING FROM PHILADELPHIA'S SCHOOL REFORM

Adequate Yearly Progress: Where Philadelphia Public Schools Stand 2004

PHILADELPHIA PUBLIC SCHOOL
NOTEBOOK

The information in this booklet first appeared in the Winter 2004-05 issue of the Philadelphia Public School Notebook, an independent newspaper promoting informed public involvement in the Philadelphia schools. For more information, please visit www.thenotebook.org.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
‘No Child Left Behind’ and AYP in Pennsylvania	2,3
Key to the Tables	3
Elementary Schools	4,5,6
K-4 Schools	6
Middle Schools	7
High Schools	8
Charter Schools	9
Disciplinary & Special Schools	9

Introduction

Adequate Yearly Progress: Where Philadelphia Public Schools Stand, 2004

Schools and school districts across the country are under pressure to show that student performance on standardized tests is improving. Much of this pressure is based on the idea that clear expectations, combined with sanctions for poor performance, will motivate educators and students to try harder and do better. The federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) is the most comprehensive expression of this pressure. NCLB sets performance targets that schools and districts must meet - referred to as “Adequate Yearly Progress” (AYP). NCLB also outlines a series of escalating consequences for not meeting AYP targets.

In response, school districts and state departments of education are providing large amounts of data about student performance and school progress to educators, parents, and the general public. The theory behind this emphasis on data is that if educators have more information about their students, they can improve the ways they teach and influence how well their students perform. This data can also be an important resource for parents and community members who want to find out about their local schools and become part of efforts to improve them.

Research for Action (RFA) is committed to developing a set of resources to help the public take advantage of the increasing availability of school performance data in order to influence policy and improve schools. As part of this effort, RFA is pleased to partner with

the *Philadelphia Public School Notebook* to provide tools designed to help educators and the public better understand AYP.

In addition, because AYP is only one among many possible means of evaluating students and schools, RFA will be looking at other ways of using data and measuring student achievement to help educators and the public become informed, active participants in school improvement efforts in the era of No Child Left Behind.

Research for Action (RFA) is a Philadelphia-based non-profit organization engaged in education research and evaluation. Founded in 1992, RFA works with public school districts, educational institutions, and community organizations to improve the educational opportunities for those traditionally disadvantaged by race/ethnicity, class, gender, language/cultural difference, and ability/disability.

Learning from Philadelphia’s School Reform, led by RFA, is a four-year research and public awareness project assessing the current reform efforts in Philadelphia public schools. Future resources will examine how schools learn to use achievement data and will analyze student outcomes. For more information, please visit: www.researchforaction.org.

The Philadelphia Public School Notebook is an independent newspaper promoting informed public involvement in the Philadelphia schools. For more information, please visit www.thenotebook.org.

'No Child Left Behind' and AYP in Pennsylvania

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, signed into law in 2002, gave the federal government a new, much larger role in K-12 education, with the stated goal of holding public schools more accountable for student achievement. For states to receive federal education funds, the government requires statewide student testing in reading, math, and science for students in public schools (including charter schools), as well as the introduction of an accountability system requiring school improvement on these tests.

Under NCLB, failure to meet targets for test scores in reading and math can trigger significant consequences for the school and the district, as well as new options for families. NCLB also holds schools accountable for the percentage of students that are tested, and which students are tested, in each school.

Each year, states and districts must issue "report cards" with statewide and school-by-school data for all schools, districts and charter schools. Under NCLB, schools must also notify parents about their right to request the qualifications of their children's teachers. Parents also have the right to know if their children have been taught for four or more weeks in a row by a teacher who does not meet state criteria for being "highly qualified."

Measuring "Adequate Yearly Progress" (AYP)

NCLB aims to have all public school students scoring at "proficient" or "advanced" levels on state reading and math tests by the end of the 2013-14 school year. NCLB holds schools and districts accountable for "Adequate Yearly Progress" toward meeting that goal. AYP is the minimum level of performance that states, school districts, and schools must achieve each year in these areas:

- the percentage of students who met test score goals (outlined below)
- the percentage of students who took the tests ("test participation"), which must be 95 percent or higher
- graduation rates for high schools (in Pennsylvania, the target is 80 percent or improvement)
- one other measure of school performance, chosen by the state, for elementary and middle schools (in Pennsylvania, schools must have attendance of 90 percent or show improvement).

Testing requirements

Measures of school progress in Pennsylvania have been based on results of the state standardized test in reading and math, known as the PSSA (Pennsylvania System of School Assessment). In 2005, the PSSA will be given to students in grades 3, 5, 8 and 11 (this will be the first year that third graders' scores count in calculating adequate yearly progress). Beginning in the 2005-06 school year, tests must be administered every year in grades 3 through 8 in math and reading and once in high school. Beginning in the 2007-08 school year, science achievement will also be tested.

In compliance with NCLB, Pennsylvania has set escalating test score targets for schools from 2002-03 to 2013-14 (right).

To make sure schools are held accountable for all students, NCLB requires test scores to be broken down ("disaggregated") by "subgroups" to track the performance of the following groups of students within the overall school population:

- students of each of the major racial/ethnic groups (Black, Latino, Asian, White, etc.)
- students with disabilities
- students who are economically disadvantaged students
- students with limited English proficiency status

Any subgroup representing 40 or more students must meet the same goals for test scores and test participation for a school to make AYP. The more such subgroups, the more targets the school must reach to achieve AYP.

Other ways of making AYP

Even at schools that fall short of these test score targets for proficiency, there are other ways of making AYP:

Safe harbor status is a way for a school or district to achieve AYP without meeting the standard achievement targets (in 2004, these targets were 45 percent in reading; 35 percent in mathematics). If a school or subgroup does not meet the performance targets but does reduce the percentage of below-proficient students by 10 percent or more, the state will consider it to have met AYP for this target area. A school where 90 percent of students are not proficient would achieve safe harbor if it reduced that percentage by 9 or more points.

Confidence intervals may allow schools to achieve AYP when they fall just short of reaching targets for proficiency or safe harbor. The confidence interval is a statistical adjustment made by the state that provides a margin of error to take into account the fact that the students in the tested grades may not be a representative sample of all the students in the school.

Appeals can be filed by schools on one of three grounds: "data error," "special circumstances," and "significant improvement." Schools that have fallen short of their AYP targets, even using safe harbor and confidence intervals, can appeal to the state to be recognized for significant improvement by meeting growth targets on a measure called the "Pennsylvania Performance Index" (PPI), which is sensitive to test score improvements that fall below the proficient level.

The index measures changes in student performance in the "Basic" and "Below Basic" categories. It divides both "Basic" and "Below Basic" into two levels, so that movement within and between these levels can be credited. For example, movement of large numbers

	Reading: Percent Proficient/Advanced	Math: Percent Proficient/Advanced	of students from "Below Basic II" to "Below Basic I" might be sufficient to count as "significant improvement." Each school and subgroup has its own 2002 baseline PPI score, and growth targets
2002-04	45	35	
2005-07	54	45	
2008-10	63	56	
2010-11	72	67	
2011-12	81	78	
2012-13	91	89	
2013-14	100	100	

for the performance index are based on the trajectory needed to reach 100 percent proficiency by 2014.

If schools fall short of AYP goals

Schools or districts are designated as needing a level of school improvement or corrective action when they do not meet AYP targets for multiple

consecutive years and face escalating levels of consequences. Such schools are required to take certain actions before the beginning of the school year. If a school continues to fall short of AYP goals, NCLB's consequences for one year and level carry over to the next level and new ones are added. Here are the escalating levels categorizing schools that fail to make AYP targets:

Year 1 of failure to make AYP – “Warning.” The school is placed on notice that it has another year to develop its improvement strategies and achieve its AYP targets. The school is not subject to consequences.

Year 2 – “School Improvement I.” Officials must develop a two-year school improvement plan. Districts must offer students the option to transfer from the “improvement” school to another public school that isn’t facing consequences. The district pays for transportation.

Year 3 – “School Improvement II.” Districts must offer low-income students free tutoring services from a list of approved providers (known as “supplemental educational services”).

Year 4 – “Corrective Action I.” When a school does not make “Adequate Yearly Progress” for four consecutive years, the state will place it under a “corrective action plan.” The consequences may be changes in the staff or curriculum, lengthening the school day or year, or some other action.

Year 5 – “Corrective Action II.” If a school continues to be identified as in need of improvement, it necessitates creation of a new plan to be carried out the following year, including at least one radical change: replacing the staff, converting to a charter, turning over management of the school to the state or a private company, or other major management

restructuring. Parents must be involved in decisions about the plan.

Year 6 – “Corrective Action II, second year,” also known as “restructuring.” If the school still fails to make adequate yearly progress, the plan for school restructuring is to be implemented.

A school identified as “Making Progress” is one that was previously in either school improvement or corrective action but has made AYP for one year. If the school fulfills its AYP requirement for a second year, it will exit the improvement system and will be counted among schools that have “Met AYP.” If in the second year it does not achieve AYP, the school reverts to the next level of school improvement or corrective action.

Sources:

- Pennsylvania Department of Education, Bureau of Assessment and Accountability
- United States Department of Education
- For more information, see www.nclb.gov and www.pde.statepa.us.
- Special thanks to Pennsylvania Public Education Partnership
This article is adapted from “No Child Left Behind’ in Pennsylvania” originally published by Mon Valley Education Consortium (www.mvec.org), 2004.

Key to the Tables

Schools are listed alphabetically, last name first. **Schools in red** met all of their AYP targets in 2004. ☆ **Bolded schools in red** met all of their AYP targets in 2004 and either met AYP or had “Warning” status in 2003. For more information about AYP targets and AYP status, please see “No Child Left Behind’ and AYP in Pennsylvania,” pp 2-3.

TARGETS met/total: The number of AYP targets the school met, followed by the total number of targets. Schools have targets for test score performance and test participation in reading and math, and either attendance rate (at elementary and middle schools) or graduation rate (at high schools). But the total number of targets varies from school to school. This is because schools must meet the targets associated with any subgroups that have more than 40 students in the tested grades in the school. For a school or district to meet AYP, all AYP targets must be met.

AYP status: See above for definitions of “Warning,” “School Improvement,” and “Corrective Action” status. Schools labeled as having “Met AYP” met all their AYP targets in 2004 and either met AYP or had “Warning” status in 2003. Schools that are “Making Progress” met all their test performance and participation targets in 2004 but were in School Improvement or Corrective Action in 2003; their prior year AYP

status is shown in parentheses (SI I = School Improvement I; CA II = Corrective Action II). A “Making Progress” school that fails to meet its target in 2005 will move down to the next level of the school improvement cycle.

How achieved: For schools that met all their AYP targets, the symbols indicate whether a school’s test results met the state’s proficiency standards or whether the school achieved AYP through “safe harbor” or the appeals process.

⊙ = Met all the proficiency targets – with or without the help of a confidence interval.

◆ = Achieved AYP through safe harbor, reducing the percentage of below-proficient students – with or without the help of a confidence interval.

↖ = Met AYP targets through the appeals process of the PA Department of Education.

% proficient – reading: The percent of all tested students who scored proficient or above on the 2004 PSSA reading exam.

% proficient – math: The percent of all tested students who scored proficient or above on the 2004 PSSA math exam.

Elementary Schools

School	Management	TARGETS Met/Total	AYP Status	How achieved	% proficient reading	% proficient math
Adaire Alexander	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊙	47.1	48.0
Alcorn James	Edison	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	↖	19.7	11.0
Allen Ethan	District	16/17	School Improvement I	-	32.4	25.8
Allen Ethel	District	6/12	Warning	-	11.3	8.5
Anderson Add B	Edison	11/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	23.0	24.3
Arthur Chester A	District	5/5	Making Progress (CA II)	⊙	47.2	57.1
Bache–Martin	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	➕	36.0	29.6
Barry Comm John	Restructured	9/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	26.6	13.0
Bethune Mary McLeod	Victory	7/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	14.0	6.5
Blaine James G	District	9/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	11.6	10.1
☆ Blankenburg Rudolph	Restructured	13/13	Met AYP	➕	36.2	24.1
Bluford Guion	District	7/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	16.0	11.2
Bregy F. Amadee	District	5/5	Making Progress (CA II)	➕	23.1	23.1
☆ Bridesburg	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	73.3	83.3
☆ Brown Joseph H	District	9/9	Met AYP	⊙	47.9	51.1
Bryant William C	U. of Penn	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	19.2	10.4
Carnell Laura H	District	10/17	School School Improvement I	-	36.0	28.2
Cassidy Lewis C	Restructured	10/13	School School Improvement II	-	32.1	29.8
Cleveland Grover	Restructured	9/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	21.2	9.1
Clymer George	District	11/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	15.3	13.4
☆ Comegys Benjamin B	Edison	13/13	Met AYP	➕	33.3	29.4
☆ Comly Watson	District	5/5	Met AYP	⊙	58.8	61.8
☆ Cook–Wissahickon	District	9/9	Met AYP	⊙	72.7	69.1
Cramp William	District	11/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	28.2	36.8
Creighton Thomas	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	➕	30.5	26.0
☆ Crossan Kennedy C	District	5/5	Met AYP	⊙	57.1	64.3
☆ Daroff Samuel	District	13/13	Met AYP	➕	23.3	21.4
Day Anna B	District	13/13	Making Progress (SI I)	➕	30.3	33.3
DeBurgos Bilingual	Restructured	13/21	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	16.9	15.0
☆ Decatur Stephen	District	17/17	Met AYP	➕	48.1	44.9
☆ Dick William	District	13/13	Met AYP	➕	25.8	15.2
Disston Hamilton	District	13/13	Making Progress (SI I)	⊙	45.1	52.0
☆ Dobson James	District	9/9	Met AYP	⊙	69.2	56.9
Douglass Frederick	District	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	23.1	8.2
Drew Charles R	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	➕	36.1	26.0
☆ Duckrey Tanner	Temple	13/13	Met AYP	➕	22.6	17.0
Dunbar Paul L	Temple	4/5	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	27.6	36.4
☆ Edmonds Franklin S	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	58.2	54.9
Edmunds Henry R	District	17/17	Making Progress (SI I)	➕	32.5	25.1
Ellwood	District	13/13	Making Progress (SI I)	⊙	48.7	46.2
Emlen Eleanor Cope	Restructured	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊙	56.0	55.6
Fairhill	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊙	39.3	42.0
☆ Farrell Louis H	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	61.2	67.0
Fell D Newlin	District	16/17	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	38.3	37.4
Ferguson Joseph C	Temple	7/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	3.9	6.5
☆ Finletter Thomas K	District	13/13	Met AYP	↖	29.2	21.3
Fitler Academics Plus	District	13/13	Making Progress (SI I)	⊙	67.3	54.5
FitzPatrick Aloysius	District	12/13	School Improvement II	-	31.1	37.2
Forrest Edwin	District	13/13	Making Progress (SI I)	⊙	41.2	46.6
Fox Chase	District	9/9	Making Progress (SI I)	⊙	60.8	45.1
☆ Frank Anne	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	66.9	85.1
☆ Franklin Benjamin	District	17/17	Met AYP	⊙	59.7	47.9
☆ Fulton Robert	Foundations	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	46.9	36.7
☆ Gideon Edward	Restructured	13/13	Met AYP	↖	17.8	15.1

KEY

Schools are listed alphabetically, last name first. Schools in red met all of their AYP targets in 2004. ☆ **Bolded schools in red** met all of their AYP targets in 2004 and either met AYP or had “Warning” status in 2003. For more information about AYP targets and AYP status, please see “No Child Left Behind’ and AYP in Pennsylvania,” pp 2-3.

How achieved: ⊙= Met all the proficiency targets – with or with-

- : out the help of a confidence interval; ➕= Achieved AYP through safe
- : harbor, reducing the percentage of below-proficient students – with or
- : without the help of a confidence interval; ↖= Achieved AYP targets
- : through the appeals process of the PA Department of Education.
- : **% proficient – reading:** The percent of all tested students who scored
- : proficient or above on the 2004 PSSA reading exam.
- : **% proficient – math:** The percent of all tested students who scored
- : proficient or above on the 2004 PSSA math exam.

Elementary Schools

School	Management	TARGETS Met/Total	AYP Status	How achieved	% proficient reading	% proficient math
☆ Gompers Samuel	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	38.6	29.8
☆ Greenberg Joseph	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	71.6	68.4
☆ Greenfield Albert	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	45.1	42.4
Hackett Horatio B	District	11/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	31.7	33.7
Hamilton Andrew	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊙	47.6	43.4
☆ Hancock John	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	85.5	82.6
Harrison William	District	5/5	Making Progress (CA II)	+	27.3	13.6
Harrity William F	Edison	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	+	37.4	26.4
Hartranft John F	Restructured	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	+	20.3	15.6
☆ Henry Charles W	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	68.0	51.6
Heston Edward	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊙	60.0	64.0
Hill Leslie P	Restructured	12/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	34.1	27.6
Holme Thomas	District	11/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	35.7	26.4
Hopkinson Francis	District	15/17	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	37.1	33.6
☆ Houston Henry E	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	44.8	38.9
☆ Howe Julia Ward	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	79.1	76.7
Huey Samuel B	Restructured	10/13	Corrective Action II (first year)	-	20.1	13.0
Hunter William	District	9/9	Making Progress (CA II)	+	15.1	22.6
Jackson Andrew	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	+	37.2	38.5
☆ Jenks John S	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	56.7	48.1
☆ Kearny Gen Philip	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	69.0	52.9
Kelley William D	Edison	5/5	Making Progress (CA II)	+	15.8	13.5
Key Francis Scott	District	9/9	Making Progress (CA II)	⊙	44.6	46.4
☆ Kinsey John L	Foundations	13/13	Met AYP	↙	18.2	26.3
Kirkbride Eliza B	District	15/15	Making Progress (CA II)	⊙	40.7	46.1
Lamberton Robert E	District	13/13	Making Progress (SI I)	↙	23.0	13.3
Lawton Henry W	District	12/13	School Improvement I	-	44.0	38.7
Lea Henry C	U. of Penn	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	24.2	15.5
☆ Leidy Joseph	Restructured	5/5	Met AYP	↙	34.2	32.4
☆ Levering William	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	51.0	41.3
☆ Lingelbach Anna L	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	61.5	51.9
Locke Alain	Edison	6/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	13.0	15.6
☆ Loesche William H	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	67.9	70.5
Logan	Restructured	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	+	15.9	15.9
Longstreth William C	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊙	41.7	38.1
Ludlow James R	Edison	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	+	34.5	38.8
Mann William B	District	7/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	20.0	19.4
Marshall John	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊙	40.3	29.2
Marshall Thurgood	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	+	39.7	25.2
☆ Mayfair	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	63.5	60.6
☆ McCall Gen George A	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	50.3	58.7
McCloskey John F	District	9/9	Making Progress (SI I)	+	29.5	18.3
McKinley William	Restructured	9/9	Making Progress (CA II)	+	31.9	40.4
McMichael Morton	Edison	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	+	31.9	17.9
Meade Gen George C	Temple	7/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	8.3	4.2
☆ Meredith William M	District	17/17	Met AYP	⊙	78.2	73.1
Mifflin Thomas	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊙	62.5	46.9
Moffet John	District	9/9	Making Progress (CA II)	⊙	63.3	65.0
☆ Moore J Hampton	District	17/17	Met AYP	⊙	50.6	56.9
☆ Morris Robert	Foundations	13/13	Met AYP	+	26.5	38.2
Morrison Andrew J	District	17/17	Making Progress (CA II)	⊙	50.3	46.9
Munoz-Marin	Edison	15/17	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	17.8	14.3
Nebinger George W	District	11/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	28.4	30.9
Olney	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	+	31.9	43.5

KEY

Schools are listed alphabetically, last name first. Schools in red met all of their AYP targets in 2004. ☆ **Bolded schools in red** met all of their AYP targets in 2004 and either met AYP or had “Warning” status in 2003. For more information about AYP targets and AYP status, please see “No Child Left Behind’ and AYP in Pennsylvania,” pp 2-3.

How achieved: ⊙= Met all the proficiency targets – with or with-

- : out the help of a confidence interval; + = Achieved AYP through safe
- : harbor, reducing the percentage of below-proficient students – with or
- : without the help of a confidence interval; ↙ = Achieved AYP targets
- : through the appeals process of the PA Department of Education.
- : **% proficient – reading:** The percent of all tested students who scored
- : proficient or above on the 2004 PSSA reading exam.
- : **% proficient – math:** The percent of all tested students who scored
- : proficient or above on the 2004 PSSA math exam.

Elementary Schools

School	Management	TARGETS Met/Total	AYP Status	How achieved	% proficient reading	% proficient math
Overbrook Education Ctr	District	12/13	School Improvement II	-	48.6	28.6
Overbrook	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊙	39.7	32.8
Pastorius Francis P	Foundations	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	24.6	19.2
☆ Peirce Thomas M	District	13/13	Met AYP	⚡	25.7	25.7
☆ Penn Alexander	District	9/9	Met AYP	⊙	61.0	53.7
Pennell Joseph	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	+	35.1	29.9
Pennypacker Samuel	District	13/13	Making Progress (SI I)	⊙	46.9	45.7
Penrose	District	13/13	Making Progress (SI I)	⊙	42.1	32.9
☆ Pollock Robert B	District	9/9	Met AYP	⊙	63.5	70.4
Potter–Thomas	Edison	7/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	9.8	4.8
Pratt Anna B	Victory	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	15.7	11.8
Prince Hall	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊙	53.8	40.7
☆ Reynolds Gen John F	District	13/13	Met AYP	+	19.0	21.0
☆ Rhawnhurst	District	9/9	Met AYP	⊙	69.8	74.1
Rhoads James	District	10/13	Corrective Action II (first year)	-	17.5	18.5
Richmond	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊙	40.4	36.0
Rowen William	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊙	41.5	41.5
Sharswood George	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊙	50.6	45.3
☆ Shawmont	District	17/17	Met AYP	⊙	59.9	57.7
Sheridan Philip H	District	7/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	8.3	4.1
Smedley Franklin	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	+	20.4	25.0
Smith Walter G	District	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	15.4	14.1
Solis–Cohen Solomon	District	12/13	School Improvement I	-	39.9	50.0
Southwark	District	17/17	Making Progress (CA II)	+	32.9	25.7
☆ Spring Garden	District	5/5	Met AYP	⊙	46.1	44.7
☆ Spruance Gilbert	District	25/25	Met AYP	⊙	59.3	49.6
Stanton Edwin M	Universal	5/5	Making Progress (CA II)	+	23.1	15.4
Stanton M Hall	Restructured	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊙	70.7	46.7
Stearne Allen M	District	12/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	29.6	15.5
Steel Edward	Restructured	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	24.0	13.7
Sullivan James J	District	16/17	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	26.4	24.8
Taggart John H	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊙	37.9	45.2
Vare Abigail	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	+	29.3	22.8
Waring Laura	Edison	5/5	Making Progress (CA II)	+	27.3	21.2
☆ Washington George	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	44.3	37.1
Washington Martha	Restructured	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊙	39.7	37.0
Webster John H	District	16/17	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	13.0	14.2
☆ Welsh John	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	58.8	65.9
Whittier John G	District	7/12	Warning	-	30.7	27.2
☆ Wilson Alexander	U. of Penn	5/5	Met AYP	+	25.7	30.2
Wister John	District	12/13	Corrective Action II 2nd year)	-	23.9	21.8
Wright Richard R	Victory	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	+	20.0	21.5
Ziegler William H	District	13/13	Making Progress (SI I)	⊙	46.7	31.1

K-4 Schools

School	TARGETS Met	AYP Status
Barton Clara	Yes	Making Progress (CA II)
Birney Gen Davis B	Yes	Making Progress (CA II)
Brown Henry A	No	Warning
Catharine Joseph	Yes	Making Progress (CA II)
Cayuga	No	Warning
☆ Childs George W	Yes	Met AYP
Elkin Lewis	No	Warning
☆ Feltonville	Yes	Met AYP
Girard Stephen	No	Warning
Harrington Avery D	Yes	Making Progress (CA II)
☆ Jenks Abram	Yes	Met AYP
Kelly John B	Yes	Making Progress (CA II)
☆ Lowell James R	Yes	Met AYP
☆ McClure Alexander	Yes	Met AYP

School	TARGETS Met	AYP Status
McDaniel Delaplaine	No	Corrective Action II (2nd year)
☆ Mitchell	Yes	Met AYP
Morton Thomas G	Yes	Making Progress (CA II)
Patterson John M	Yes	Making Progress (CA II)
☆ Powel Samuel	Yes	Met AYP
Sheppard Isaac	No	Corrective Action II (2nd year)
☆ Taylor Bayard	Yes	Met AYP
Willard Frances E	Yes	Making Progress (CA II)

Note: There are no PSSA results for Philadelphia's 22 K-4 schools. The District was required to identify any K-4 schools that are low-performing based on other standardized test scores or performance criteria. Next year, with third grade test scores being reported for the first time, K-4 schools will be rated for AYP on the same basis as other elementary schools. All K-4 schools are District-managed.

Middle Schools

School	Management	TARGETS Met/Total	AYP Status	How achieved	% proficient reading	% proficient math
AMY at Martin	District	17/17	Making Progress (SI I)	⊙	58.6	50.0
☆ AMY at NW	District	9/9	Met AYP	⊙	61.1	32.2
☆ Baldi C C A	District	29/29	Met AYP	⊕	68.3	62.7
Barratt Norris S	Edison	17/17	Making Progress (CA II)	⊕	32.3	31.5
Beeber Dimner	District	7/13	Warning	-	31.6	16.4
Central East	District	25/29	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	31.9	29.8
Clemente Roberto	District	17/25	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	15.4	10.9
☆ Conwell Russell	District	21/21	Met AYP	⊙	70.9	71.7
Cooke Jay	District	15/17	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	25.1	26.3
Elverson James	Temple	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊕	28.1	9.2
FitzSimons Thomas Acad	Victory	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	22.0	10.8
Gillespie Eliz D	Edison	4/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	21.3	5.3
☆ Girard Acad Music Prog	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	86.2	76.1
Harding Warren G	District	22/25	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	40.9	26.0
☆ Hill-Freedman	District	9/9	Met AYP	⊙	89.8	84.7
Jones John Paul	District	16/29	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	17.1	19.4
LaBrum Gen J Harry	District	9/9	Making Progress (SI I)	⊙	57.8	30.2
Leeds Morris E	District	11/13	School Improvement II	-	36.3	19.9
Lewis Ada H	Foundations	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊕	21.0	14.8
☆ Masterman Julia R	District	21/21	Met AYP	⊙	98.5	97.2
Meehan Austin	District	19/21	School Improvement II	-	46.6	31.9
☆ Middle Years Alt	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	65.6	44.8
Peirce William S	Universal	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	↖	27.5	9.9
Penn Treaty	Edison	26/29	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	20.2	23.2
Pepper George	Victory	17/17	Making Progress (CA II)	⊕	28.6	23.2
Pickett Clarence E	Foundations	7/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	15.4	5.5
Rhodes E. W. Academy	Victory	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	23.7	12.2
Roosevelt Theodore	Restructured	11/17	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	30.4	13.0
Rush Benjamin	District	20/21	School Improvement II	-	50.3	37.7
Sayre William L	Restructured	12/13	Making Progress (CA II)	↖	28.5	15.4
Shaw Anna H	Edison	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊕	19.5	14.4
Shoemaker Wm H	District	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	28.6	9.2
Stetson John B	Edison	5/21	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	7.6	10.8
Stoddart-Fleisher	Edison	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	↖	34.0	18.5
Sulzberger Mayer	Edison	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⊕	27.5	17.2
Thomas George C	District	17/17	Making Progress (SI I)	↖	31.5	38.5
Tilden William T	Edison	14/17	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	18.6	12.3
Turner John P	District	12/13	Making Progress (CA II)	↖	43.5	17.1
Vare Edwin H	Universal	18/21	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	24.2	18.2
Vaux Roberts	Restructured	7/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	23.3	7.4
Wagner Gen Louis	District	15/17	School Improvement I	-	49.4	50.0
Wanamaker John	Temple	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	18.1	11.1
☆ Washington Grover	District	29/29	Met AYP	↖	39.6	26.9
Wilson Woodrow	District	29/29	Making Progress (CA II)	⊕	57.5	45.4

KEY

Schools are listed alphabetically, last name first. Schools in red met all of their AYP targets in 2004. ☆ **Bolded schools in red** met all of their AYP targets in 2004 and either met AYP or had "Warning" status in 2003. For more information about AYP targets and AYP status, please see "No Child Left Behind" and AYP in Pennsylvania," pp 2-3.

How achieved: ⊙= Met all the proficiency targets – with or with-

- : out the help of a confidence interval; ⊕= Achieved AYP through safe harbor, reducing the percentage of below-proficient students – with or without the help of a confidence interval; ↖= Achieved AYP targets through the appeals process of the PA Department of Education.
- : **% proficient – reading:** The percent of all tested students who scored proficient or above on the 2004 PSSA reading exam.
- : **% proficient – math:** The percent of all tested students who scored proficient or above on the 2004 PSSA math exam.

High Schools

School	Management	TARGETS		How achieved	% proficient reading	% proficient math
		Met/Total	AYP Status			
Audenried Charles	District	1/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	5.9	1.9
Bartram Comm/Motiv	District	6/12	Warning	-	26.1	17.4
Bartram John	District	16/16	Making Progress (CA II)	↖	10.8	3.5
Bartram Human Services	District	0/12	Warning	-	12.9	5.7
☆ Bodine William W	District	9/9	Met AYP	⊙	84.0	70.4
Bok Edward AVTS	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	↖	13.7	23.2
Carroll Charles	District	1/9	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	8.6	6.3
☆ Carver	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	87.4	73.9
☆ Central	District	25/25	Met AYP	⊙	92.5	92.6
☆ Creative & Perf Arts	District	17/17	Met AYP	⊙	74.7	46.5
Dobbins Murrell AVTS	District	7/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	11.9	3.0
Douglas Stephen A	District	3/5	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	0.0	0.0
Edison	District	17/25	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	6.3	2.4
Fels Samuel	District	3/17	School Improvement II	-	11.6	12.1
Frankford	District	17/25	School Improvement II	-	11.6	11.7
Franklin Benjamin	District	12/13	Making Progress (CA II)	↖	8.0	2.8
Franklin Learning Center	District	12/13	School Improvement I	-	52.8	28.9
Furness Horace	District	15/21	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	15.0	31.3
Germantown	District	10/13	School Improvement II	-	11.3	11.6
☆ Girard Acad Music Prog	District	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	86.2	76.1
☆ Girls	District	21/21	Met AYP	⊙	83.1	78.0
Gratz Simon	District	10/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	10.5	3.7
Kensington	District	16/19	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	13.3	5.1
King Martin Luther	Foundations	8/15	School Improvement II	-	14.0	7.5
Lamberton Robert E	District	13/13	Making Progress (SI I)	↖	23.0	13.3
Lankenau Germantown	District	12/13	Warning	-	50.0	27.9
Lincoln Abraham	District	12/21	School Improvement II	-	28.9	14.6
Mastbaum Jules E AVTS	District	9/17	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	11.7	4.5
☆ Masterman Julia R	District	21/21	Met AYP	⊙	98.5	97.2
Northeast	District	26/33	School Improvement II	-	34.8	29.4
Olney	District	0/17	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	11.7	9.6
Overbrook	District	13/13	Making Progress (SI I)	↖	13.0	4.3
☆ Parkway Program	District	8/8	Met AYP	⊙	42.3	40.8
☆ Parkway-Center City	District	8/8	Met AYP	⊙	48.4	34.4
Penn William	District	6/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	10.6	7.3
Philadelphia Regional	District	5/9	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	10.2	3.6
Roxborough	District	13/13	Making Progress (SI I)	↖	25.6	16.5
Saul W B Agricultural	District	13/13	Making Progress (SI I)	⬆	41.3	27.8
South Philadelphia	District	5/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	8.5	17.9
Strawberry Mansion	District	13/13	Making Progress (CA II)	⬆	23.0	34.9
Swenson Arts & Tech	District	16/17	School Improvement II	-	20.0	11.6
University City	District	0/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	14.5	11.4
Washington George	District	24/33	School Improvement II	-	40.8	33.8
West Philadelphia	District	7/13	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	9.2	3.2

KEY

Schools are listed alphabetically, last name first. Schools in red met all of their AYP targets in 2004. ☆ **Bolded schools in red** met all of their AYP targets in 2004 and either met AYP or had "Warning" status in 2003. For more information about AYP targets and AYP status, please see "No Child Left Behind" and AYP in Pennsylvania," pp 2-3.

How achieved: ⊙= Met all the proficiency targets – with or with-

- : out the help of a confidence interval; ⬆= Achieved AYP through safe harbor, reducing the percentage of below-proficient students – with or without the help of a confidence interval; ↖= Achieved AYP targets through the appeals process of the PA Department of Education.
- : **% proficient – reading:** The percent of all tested students who scored proficient or above on the 2004 PSSA reading exam.
- : **% proficient – math:** The percent of all tested students who scored proficient or above on the 2004 PSSA math exam.

Charter Schools

School	TARGETS Met/Total	AYP Status	How achieved	% proficient reading	% proficient math
Alliance	7/9	School Improvement II	-	13.0	17.4
Architecture & Design HS	8/9	School Improvement II	-	37.0	21.0
☆ Belmont	13/13	Met AYP	+	21.5	24.6
☆ Christopher Columbus	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	44.0	49.0
Community Acad of Phila	10/17	School Improvement II	-	15.6	6.6
Delaware Valley HS	5/9	School Improvement II	-	16.1	2.4
Discovery	6/12	Warning	-	20.4	16.7
Eugenio Maria DeHostos	5/9	School Improvement II	-	12.0	14.6
Franklin Towne HS	4/9	School Improvement II	-	28.0	15.0
Freire	11/13	School Improvement II	-	30.0	10.9
Germantown Settlement	9/13	School Improvement II	-	26.2	9.8
☆ Green Woods	5/5	Met AYP	⊙	70.8	70.8
☆ Harambee Institute	13/13	Met AYP	+	29.6	18.3
Hope	0/9	School Improvement I	-	2.0	0.0
Imani Education Circle	13/13	Making Progress (SI I)	↘	17.8	25.0
Imhotep	9/9	Making Progress (SI I)	+	78.8	24.5
☆ Independence	8/8	Met AYP	⊙	42.2	42.2
KIPP Philadelphia	9/12	Warning	-	21.9	28.8
☆ Laboratory	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	100.0	100.0
Leadership Learning	6/13	School Improvement II	-	12.5	4.0
☆ Mariana Bracetti Academy	17/17	Met AYP	+	35.7	21.7
Maritime Academy	5/8	Warning	-	39.4	19.0
☆ MAST Community	13/13	Met AYP	⊙	60.3	58.8
☆ Mastery	8/8	Met AYP	⊙	43.3	35.8
Math, Civics & Sciences	12/13	School Improvement II	-	34.0	21.1
☆ Multi-Cultural Academy	5/5	Met AYP	↘	28.6	25.6
New Foundations	13/13	Making Progress (SI I)	⊙	42.9	44.0
Nueva Esperanza Academy	6/13	School Improvement I	-	10.6	2.7
☆ People for People	13/13	Met AYP	↘	12.7	16.1
Philadelphia Academy	2/4	Warning	-	26.3	7.0
Phila Electrical & Tech	15/17	School Improvement I	-	66.3	62.3
Philadelphia Perfor Arts	13/13	Making Progress (SI I)	⊙	68.4	66.3
Preparatory	8/13	School Improvement II	-	32.2	19.5
Raising Horizons Quest	10/13	Warning	-	36.9	31.4
Renaissance	11/13	School Improvement II	-	35.4	8.5
☆ Renaissance Advantage	13/13	Met AYP	+	24.0	10.4
☆ Richard Allen Prep	13/13	Met AYP	↘	21.3	8.8
Universal Institute	11/13	School Improvement I	-	31.1	25.0
Wakisha	10/13	School Improvement II	-	28.2	10.6
West Oak Lane	13/13	Making Progress (SI I)	+	30.1	14.6
☆ Wissahickon	5/5	Met AYP	+	22.7	18.2
☆ World Communications	9/9	Met AYP	⊙	51.8	29.2
Young Scholars	10/13	School Improvement I	-	53.8	23.4

Disciplinary & Special Schools

School	Management	TARGETS Met/Total	AYP Status	How achieved	% proficient reading	% proficient math
Boone Daniel	District	3/5	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	8.1	2.8
CEP - Allegheny	District	0/4	School Improvement I	-	6.7	2.2
CEP - Hunting Park	District	0/13	Warning	-	0.0	0.0
Shallcross Day	District	2/5	Corrective Action II (2nd year)	-	0.0	5.3
Widener Memorial	District	5/5	Making Progress (CA II)	↘	31.7	20.5



RESEARCH for *ACTION*

3701 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104
Phone: 215.823.2500
Fax: 215.823.2510
info@researchforaction.org
www.researchforaction.org

PHILADELPHIA PUBLIC SCHOOL
NOTEBOOK

3721 Midvale Avenue
Philadelphia, PA 19129
Phone: 215.951.0330 x107
Fax: 215.951.0342
notebook@thenotebook.org
www.thenotebook.org